Appl. No. 09/889,090
Amendment and/or Response
Reply to Office action of 9 September 2005

Page 7 of 8

REMARKS / DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

Claims 3-5 and 7-20 are pending in the application.

Claims are amended herein to replace mathematical notation with equivalent verbal phrases; the intended scope of these claims is unchanged.

The Office action rejects claims 7-20 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Claims 7-20 are appropriately amended herein.

The Office action rejects claims 3-5 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Tanioka (USP 5,929,843). The applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 3, upon which claims 4 and 5 depend, claims a liquid crystal displaying apparatus that includes calculation means for calculating digital output values Ro, Go and Bo and a digital value W, wherein the digital value W is based on both a maximum value and a minimum value digital input values.

The Examiner's attention is requested to MPEP 2142, wherein it is stated:

> "To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness ... the prior art reference (or references when combined) *must teach or suggest all the claim limitations...* If the examiner does not produce a *prima facie* case, the applicant is under no obligation to submit evidence of nonobviousness."

The Office action acknowledges that Tanioka does not disclose a value W that is a function of both the minimum and maximum of the input values (Office action, page 3, lines 10-12). The Office action asserts that it would have been obvious to use only the minimum input value to compute W (Office action, page 3, lines 12-14), but claim 3 specifically recites that the value W is based on both the maximum and minimum input values. The Office action notes that Tanioka teaches that the value W can be obtained by two values W0 and W1, as specified in Tanioka's formulas 4. However, the applicants respectfully note that neither W0 nor W1 as taught by Tanioka is dependent upon the maximum input value, and thus the value W cannot be said to be dependent upon both the maximum and minimum input values.

Because Tanioka does not teach or suggest determining a value W that is based on both the minimum and maximum input values, as specifically claimed in

J-99024 Amendment 5.909 - MAC   Atty. Docket No. J-99024

PAGE 7/8 * RCVD AT 11/10/2005 10:23:05 PM [Eastern Standard Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-6/25 * DNIS:2738300 * CSID:2152437525 * DURATION (mm-ss):02-04

Appl. No. 09/889,090   Page 8 of 8
Amendment and/or Response
Reply to Office action of 9 September 2005

claim 3, upon which claims 4 and 5 depend, the applicants respectfully request the Examiner's reconsideration of the rejection of claims 3-5 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Tanioka.

In view of the foregoing, the applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the objection(s) and/or rejection(s) of record, allow all the pending claims, and find the application in condition for allowance. If any points remain in issue that may best be resolved through a personal or telephonic interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert M. McDermott
Reg. 41,508
Att'y for Applicant(s)

1824 Federal Farm Road
Montross, VA 22520
Phone: (804) 493-0707
Fax: (215) 243-7525